



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/797,264

03/10/2004

Matthias H. Regelsberger

H10210/JDP

5357

1333 7590 05/13/2008  
EASTMAN KODAK COMPANY  
PATENT LEGAL STAFF  
343 STATE STREET  
ROCHESTER, NY 14650-2201

EXAMINER

PHAM, HAI CHI

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2861

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

05/13/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/797,264	<b>Applicant(s)</b> REGELSDERGER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Hai C. Pham	<b>Art Unit</b> 2861	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01/21/08, 04/10/08.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,26-29,32-36 and 39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,6,26-29,32-36 and 39 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114***

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 04/10/08 has been entered.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 6, 26-27, 29, 33-34 and 36 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada (JP 8-39860) in view of Uebbing et al. (US 4,982,203).

With regard to claims 1 and 6, Sawada discloses an image forming apparatus and a method for uniformizing exposure energy between respective LEDs while equalizing average exposure energy between respective LED chips (10-1 through 10-3), the method comprising calculating a light-output correction for each of a plurality of

Art Unit: 2861

subsets of the LEDs (the LEDs 12 are organized into a plurality of groups or chips 10-1 to 10-3), each sub-set being controlled by a respective one of a plurality of different controllers (each of the plurality LED chips 10-1 to 10-3 is driven by a corresponding drive circuit 14-1 to 14-3) (Fig. 3) ([0041]-[0042]), each light-output correction for one of the LED subsets being calculated based at least upon factors pertaining to (a) a light output from the LED subset associated with the light-output correction being calculated for that subset (the emission quantity is measured for each LED in a chip and the emission quantity correction adjusts the light intensity of each LED in that chip based on the measured emission quantity), and (b) an average light output from the plurality of subsets of the LEDs (the average exposure energy EA of a chip is calculated based on the exposure energy of the respective LEDs of that single chip and is compared to the predetermined desired value E0, which is the “final average exposure energy of all the chips built into a print head”) ([0019], [0024]), wherein each light-output correction for one of the LED subsets facilitates correction of the light output from its associated LED subset as a function of applied voltage or supplied current (the adjustment of the emission of the LEDs in the chip is made by altering the time duration applied to the supplied current from the corresponding drive circuit, and the adjustment is performed separately for every chip) ([0024]), adjusting the light output from the LED subsets as a function of applied voltage or supplied current in accordance with the corresponding light-output corrections (the emission quantity of the LED in each chip is adjusted based on the correction values obtained separately for each chip) ([0024]), wherein each of the plurality of subsets of the LEDs includes

more than one LED (each LED chip 10 comprises 64 LEDs 10-1 to 12-64) (Fig. 3) (see also Abstract).

Sawada teaches adjusting the time duration of the modulated current to correct for the light output of the LED and thus fails to teach the correction of the light output from each LED subset being a function of more or less applied voltage or more or less supplied current so that a dimmer LED receives more voltage or current and a brighter LED receives less voltage or current.

Nevertheless, it is old and well known in the art that one can adjust the light quantity output of the LED by altering either the magnitude of the supplied current or the pulse width of the modulated current, i.e. alter the time duration of the supplied current flowing into the LED, as evidenced by Uebbing et al., which discloses an apparatus and a method for providing correction for amount degradation in the light output of the LED in an electrophotographic recording device, wherein the correction of the light output of the LED can be performed by alternatively varying the pulse-width modulation or the magnitude of the supplied current (col. 2, lines 29-34) (col. 4, lines 19-32). It is also noted that increasing and decreasing the magnitude of the supplied current or the applied voltage results in the direct increase and decrease of the light quantity output of the LED.

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Sawada by altering the magnitude of the supplied current flowing into the LED as taught by Uebbing et al. for

the purpose of compensating for the light quantity output of the LED since Uebbing et al. this to be old and well known method for changing the light flux of the LED.

With regard to claims 26-27 and 33-34, Sawada fails to teach the factors pertaining to the above-mentioned (a) and (b) including linear functions of light output versus applied voltage or supplied current and non-linear functions of light output versus applied voltage or supplied current.

Uebbing et al. discloses an apparatus and a method for providing correction for amount degradation in the light output of the light source in an electrophotographic recording device, wherein to obtain the amount of compensation for degradation in light output, the average amount of light output for the print head is measured at various temperatures and as a function of the supplied current, the supplied current being provided by varying the system reference voltage  $V_R$  (col. 2, line 51 to col. 3, line 2) (col. 6, lines 24-65). Uebbing et al. further teaches the amount of compensation for the light output of the light recording elements including a factor as a linear function of light output versus supplied current (i.e., factor  $\times I$ , where  $I$  is the supplied current and  $\times$  the current non-linearity coefficient) (see Equation (4) at col. 6, line 34). Uebbing et al. further teaches that alternatively, the amount of compensation for the light output of the light recording elements including a factor as a non-linear function of light output versus supplied current (using partial derivatives as in Equation (6) at col. 7, line 5) (col. 6, line 66 to col. 7, line 15).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Sawada by incorporating the

linear and/or non-linear functions of light output versus supplied current as taught by Uebbing et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to accurately correct the light output of the light recording elements through a range of the supplied current such that the uniform light output of the print head is more suitable for precision gray scale printing as suggested by Uebbing et al.

With regard to claims 29 and 36, Sawada further teaches the calculating step involving using difference data describing a difference between a factor pertaining to (a) and a factor pertaining to (b) (the correction of the emission quantity of the LEDs in the plural LED chips involves measuring the emission quantity of the LEDs in a chip and the subsequent measuring of the average exposure energy of each LED chip to correct the quantity of light of each chip so as to make the average exposure energy of the LED chips equal to each other, thus implying comparing the deviation of the emission quantity of the LEDs with respect to the measured average).

4. Claims 28 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada in view of Uebbing et al., as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Kawabe et al. (US 5,812,176).

Sawada, as modified by Uebbing et al., discloses all the basic limitations of the claimed invention except for the factors pertaining to (a) and (b) including quadratic functions.

Kawabe et al. discloses an image forming apparatus and a correction method for compensating the fluctuation of the exposure amount of each of the recording

element, by measuring three times the brightness  $E_i$  of each of the recording element, calculating the averaged value  $E_o$  of all brightness values to be used as the reference brightness  $E_o$  and forming the ratio of the measured brightness  $E_i$  and the reference brightness  $E_i$ , to be used as the compensation data  $C_i$ , to be used to alter the output emission of the target recording element to compensate for the fluctuation of the brightness of target recording element (col. 25, line 50 to col. 26, line 20). Kawabe et al. further teaches the brightness of one of the recording element can be calculated by using a quadratic function corresponding to characteristics of the used array of the LEDs (col. 24, line 47-55) (col. 25, lines 39-49).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Sawada by using the quadratic function corresponding to characteristics of the used array of the LEDs to derive the light amount of the target LED as taught by Kawabe et al. since Kawabe et al. teaches this to be known in the art to use the quadratic function to obtain the same resulting amount of light for the individual light recording element.

5. Claims 32 and 39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sawada in view of Uebbing et al., as applied to claims 1 and 6 above, and further in view of Bollandsee et al. (US 5,640,190).

Sawada in view of Uebbing et al. discloses all the basic limitations of the claimed invention except for the plural subsets including the plurality of LEDs includes

Art Unit: 2861

a plurality of LEDS having substantially similar light-output-versus-applied-voltage or -supplied-current.

Bollansee et al. discloses an LED printer whose print head includes a plurality of subsets of LEDs, wherein the average of light output of each subset is adjusted by providing a current proportional to the correction factor (col. 5, lines 17-23), and wherein the subsets of LEDs are grouped by classes having about the same correction factor (col. 11, lines 13-30).

It would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to modify the device of Sawada by incorporating subsets of light emitting elements having similar light-output-versus-applied-voltage or -supplied-current as taught by Bollansee et al. The motivation for doing so would have been to allow the print head to provide a more uniform light distribution.

### ***Pertinent Prior Art***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Morita et al. (US 6,804,474), Murano (US 6,166,757) and Takesue et al. (US 4,837,787) teach changing either the magnitude or the duration period of the supplied current to control the light output of the light emitting element.

***Response to Arguments***

7. Applicant's arguments filed 01/28/08 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. The response to Applicant's arguments can be found the Advisory action issued on 02/12/08.

8. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 6, 26-29, 32-36 and 39, submitted on 04/10/08, have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

***Contact Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hai C. Pham whose telephone number is (571) 272-2260. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30AM - 5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matthew Luu can be reached on (571) 272-7663. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2861

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Hai C Pham/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2861  
May 9, 2008